

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the June 13, 2011 Meeting

Chairman: Oliver Smith; Vice Chairman: Ann Quinley; Secretary: Steve Hutchison

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent/Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance With N=Nay
P=Present R=Recuse SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: 10 July 2011

Approved: June 11, 2011

1.		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:								07:04PM				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	H U T C H I S O N	H O F L E R	G L A V I N I C	B R I T S C H		Q U I N L E Y	V I C K	L E W I S	N J O O R H W O S O O D N	S M I T H	J A C K S O N	R U D O L F	D A V I S	B A C H M A N
P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P

Notes:

Quorum Established: 13 Yes (x)

Pledge of Allegiance

2. Approval of Minutes: May 9, 2011

Motion: Approve Minutes of May 9, 2011 as corrected

Maker/Second: Vick/Glavinic **Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0 Voice**

3. Open Forum:

3.a. Glavinic wants to add the issue of maintaining Heritage Trail to next month's agenda and wants to ask VCCPG to take a turn at maintaining the trail.

4. Announcements & Items of Public Interest for Discussion:

4.a. Update on the \$425,000 Valley Center Road improvement list of proposed projects being reviewed and vetted by DPW (Bob Davis)
Davis reports no news on grant items, and that much of the Mobility SC activity is on the same topic as agenda item 5a. Need more public input on issues such as J-36.

4.b. Update on Equine Ordinance, Interim Equine Ordinance, and progress with the County in consideration and adoption. (Smith)
Smith reviewed four options presented to BOS: Status quo, Tiered, etc. Reported agreement of committee on recommending Tiered option. This will be presented to BOS. County has since put out interim equine ordinance for commercial operations. Violations of zoning will be put on hold until new ordinance is in place. Other requirements such as vector control, health and safety concerns will still be enforced while ordinance revisions are being considered.

4.c. Introduction and comments from candidates for the vacancy on the I-15 Design Review Board. Term begins in June 2011 and runs for two years. VCCPG will recommend one candidate to the Board of Supervisors for appointment. (Britsch). Sandy Smith is candidate for I-15 Design Review Board

Motion: Motion to nominate Sandy Smith for I-15 Design Review Board vacancy.

Maker/Second: Hofler/Quinley **Carries/Fails: 13-0-0 Voice**

4.d. Introduction and comments from candidates for VCCPG Seat number 6 recently vacated by Victoria Cloutier (Britsch)
Michael Karp spoke first of his qualifications previous civic experience, farmer, therapist Glavinic questioned about master planned communities; Jenna Reyes; Robert Franck spoke second, involved in several civic causes, Glavinic questioned about master planned communities; Michael Robledo [3] civic experience, veteran, Glavinic questioned re msp

4.e. Update on initial meeting of the Accretive Sub-Committee (Hutchison)
Hutchison reported that the SC elected Sandy Smith Vice Chair, and Patricia LaChappelle Secretary. The SC wrote a mission statement and renamed the SC the I-15/395 Master Planned

	Community SC to be consistent with nomenclature being used by the County. Made assignments of sections of the County's scoping letter to each member to review and report back seminar – style at the next meeting. Next meeting scheduled for 29 Aug. 2011 at the VC Library, 6.00 pm.	
5.	Action Items:	
5.a.	Discussion and possible vote on Mobility Subcommittee issues including Emergency Evacuation issues, the Road Standards review and VC Road safety improvements (Davis)	
Discussion: Davis reports that J-36 Community Road Standard dominated discussion at Mobility SC. Glavinic challenges whether subject is properly noticed for vote. Consensus is that it is properly noticed. Davis defends notice and availability of information. Glavinic objects that there has not been enough public input to date. Sandy Smith listed a number of attendees from different local agencies who attended meetings on this issue. S. Smith commends County for rapid response to changes made by community to the consultants' draft document. Bob Goralka, County traffic engineer, added that DPW and community worked 6-months on initial draft and more months afterward.		
Motion: Move to proceed with discussion and vote on J-36 Road Standards Policy		
Maker/Second: Davis/Vick		Carries/Fails: 12-1-0 Voice
Notes: Glavinic dissents		
Discussion: S. Smith presents that J-36 Group wanted to create several zones for different treatments within Valley Center. In future, developers will be able to go to one of four tables to get design guidance. Policy Applies to areas outside of travel lanes. Developers can identify what is preferred, allowed and not allowed. Davis asks about clear recovery zone. Bob Goralka [DPW] responds that it is a setback that limits obstacles to minimize traffic hazards that could adversely influence fatalities and injury.		
Goralka addresses the Zone 1 Industrial recommendations table i.e. curb/gutter, lighting, median, landscape, crosswalks pathways, shoulders, parking, furniture etc. Goralka speaks to North/South Villages, Zone 2, how suggestions will be worked into village designs to come, using the same table topics with discussion of maintenance financing within villages. O. Smith questions on-street parking on Valley Center Rd. versus on side roads. S. Smith responds that in commercial areas, on-street parking is desirable where practical [bike lanes could be an issue]. Not allowing on-street parking in most areas means that less pavement for the road is required. Glavinic asks about on-street parking separated from sidewalk by planter or trail. S. Smith addresses exceptions to facilitate access to sidewalk from parking in commercial areas. Davis says that flexibility of planters can also limit access from parking to sidewalk. Goralka then speaks to Zone 2 Village Residential Table 3. Goralka addresses Zone 3 Table 4, semi-rural and rural areas, that have the same headings as other tables. S. Smith adds that indicated pathways are Type D pathways, and that such pathways are limited to one side of road so larger, single pathways are possible. In Villages, there will be pathways on both sides of road. Tom Bumgardner asks about requirements for paved shoulders on private roads, S. Smith responds that this standard doesn't apply to private roads. S. Smith will try to create a 'cheat sheet' for project review purposes with salient aspects of the policy. Norwood-Johnson asks if this applies for all new construction. S. Smith says it could apply to both large and small projects.		
J-36 would not cause more right-of-way [ROW] to be taken. All of the road edge elements are done within ROW. Josette Franck asks about residents' responsibility for maintenance of plantings in the event of road widening. County would bear responsibility for improvements proposed. Davis addresses concerns about adding costs to road development. Says objective was to minimize added costs by limiting amount of pavement and other structures. T. Bumgardner says County adds designations for Bike routes before actual improvement. Goralka says all designated bike routes are mapped but not posted until improvements are made. Bikes can ride any road legally.		
Larry Glavinic says there are logical consequences to what is being proposed. He is not opposed to the general intent of improved road appearance. He feels some of VC charm is disorganization. He doesn't want VC to be a standardized suburban environment. He claims making the policy a 'standard' makes property-owners responsible for paying for improvements and forces them to decide economically whether to proceed with development projects. He worries that interests outside our purview could dramatically alter our vision for VC roads. He claims there are many interpretive areas in the proposed policy. He cited road		

edge flammability during 2003 fire that was the chief concern of one constituent. He wants the policy document divided in two sections: 1) standards for road design and 2) interpretive issues that could be suggestions. Davis responds that the existing 'standards' are codified and are more expensive and not reflective of VC sensibilities. Davis continues that a road edge of more natural structures is likely to have neutral or less cost impact than existing County standards. Glavinic adds re fire safety, vegetation at the road edge makes for fire-tunnels [over-hanging trees]; Davis responds that the fire marshal is addressing edge clearing. Hofler responds that the County is responsible for road edge development costs. And, they are already subject to the community plan. Community is asking for something slightly different than existing road edge standard. Vick says that North & South Villages don't want "dogpatch," they want something nice. Village plans will conform to the standards of VC community. Glavinic doesn't understand need for flammable vegetation as listed in appendix because of liability. Glavinic reiterates dividing policy into road structure requirements and guidelines for other aspects. Hofler says policy needs teeth. Glavinic objects to "standard" aspect. O. Smith responds that 'guidelines' eliminate 'requirements' and then developers consistently ignore them. O. Smith defends the "exception" clause built into the proposed J-36 policy that will allow flexibility for extraordinary circumstances.

Hofler wants some of the "shoulds", "coulds", and "maybes" of the proposed policy replaced by "shall" [asks to amend the following motion to include "shalls"; maker/second agree to amend]. S. Smith identifies "shall"s on p.30 [design guidelines] p.35 re landscaping [design guidelines] O. Smith wants all requirement in single document. The policy can reference the design guidelines as a resource to avoid conflict of requirements. Davis says if we don't vote tonight it will not be on the agenda for BOS at appropriate time.

Motion: Approve J-36 road standards as drafted by road standards committee and amended by Mobility SC, including most recent amendments arising from the last Mobility SC meeting; refer walls to VC design guidelines, those are to be consistent on property and in ROW; and, delete 'garages' on p. 30 [include off-street parking for residents]; revise text 'should', 'could', and 'maybe' to 'shall' on pages 30 & 35 as discussed.

Maker/Second: Vick/Davis

Carries/Fails: 11-2-0 Voice

Notes: Glavinic, Norwood-Johnson dissent

Davis reports briefly on CERS joint meeting. Glavinic adds that there is no money for development of planned exit routes. Smith expands on the financing limitations for addressing the evacuation plans being made. Jim Quisquis [tribal SC] addresses routes across Indian reservation lands. He suggests in an emergency such roads will be opened. Smith appreciates the sentiment, but counters that private roads will not be considered because of the locked gate issue and the liability should a designated exit not be open.

5.b.

Discussion and possible vote on new Fee to Trust Proposal to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for 533 acres of land by the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. The property is located north of Lake Wohlford Road and is mostly undeveloped with some agricultural use and a home that is being rebuilt after the 2003 wildfires. (Smith)

Discussion: Smith wants to refer the item to the Tribal Liaison SC. Glavinic says SC supports transfer. The property is south of Woods Valley Road and north of Lake Wolford Road, adjacent to the north side of Lake Wolford Road as it goes by the lake. Smith questions if future development might complicate evacuation on Lake Wolford Road. Lewis asks about development plans. Jim Quisquis responds that a residential health facility for elderly maybe contemplated. Vick asks about development implications of transfer. Smith responds that it goes to reservation and would no longer be controlled or taxed by county. Glavinic wants to consider future beyond five years re exit routes and other considerations if development is more extensive. Glavinic wants to continue to interact with tribes to keep dialog open. Davis asks about water service and use of water for future development. Glavinic reports time schedule is short for County. Smith notes that VCCPG received the correspondence since the last meeting and would normally assign project to individual or SC for review followed by vote at next meeting. J. Quisquis addresses water issue and formal San Luis Rey water agreement. J. Quisquis recuses himself, as a member of requesting tribe, at Tribal Liaison SC but would help gather information, if allowed. Smith proposes to table issue until next month. Quisquis suggests VCCPG go on record as wanting to investigate and engage but needs more time. Glavinic reports next meeting for Tribal SC on 14 July. He will withdraw his motion if the issue can be handled by the Tribal SC and allow SC to continue dialog.

Motion: Move to approve fee to trust transfer [withdrawn by Glavinic]

Maker/Second: Glavinic/Hofler

Carries/Fails:

m)	Equine Ordinance - Smith, Chair	
7.	Correspondence Received:	
a)	DPLU to VCCPG, Final Agenda for the San Diego County Planning Commission Meeting on May 20, 2011, 9:00 am, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B. San Diego, CA.	
b)	SANDAG to VCCPG, Solicitation for Applications for Membership on the TransNet Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee. SANDAG is seeking a qualified member of the public to fill one vacancy on its seven-member committee from the category of the chief executive officer of a major private sector employer with demonstrated experience in leading a large organization.	
c)	San Diego County Traffic Advisory Committee to VCCPG. On April 6, 2011 the Board of Supervisors considered and approved that the existing 40 MPH speed limit on Woods Valley Road from 900 feet east of Mile 1 easterly to North Lake Wohlford Road be recertified for 40 MAPH radar speed enforcement. DPW will prepare the radar certification package for submittal to the California Highway Patrol—Oceanside Office.	
d)	DPLU to VCCPG, Johnson Administrative Permit for Oversized Residential Accessory Structures; Case Number 3000 11-012 (AD); Project Address 28357 Cole Grade Road, Valley Center; APN 189-013-19; KIVA Project 11-0144636. Applicant requests an Administrative Permit to legalize existing oversized residential accessory structures onsite to abate code violations on the property. (Norwood-Johnson)	
e)	DPLU to VCCPG Chair email April 7, 2011I, RE: Pre-App letter for 3992 11-005 (MPA) Segal Ranch, southwest corner of Cole Grade Rd and Cool Valley Rd (436 Acres)	
8.	Motion to Adjourn:	10.20pm
	Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley	Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 13-0-0. Voice